Message

From:	Barrette, Michael [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=237B7449B0084C8FAEA3A38D2BB31EA2-MBARRE04]
Sent:	2/6/2020 2:29:26 PM
To:	Gillespie, Andrew [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=dce99ece87694a06b3009d7756e2a89e-Gillespie, Andrew]; Scheitlin, Tom [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=user5f1cea1a]; Montilla, Alex [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=b148b5335ff44aea8970035668052f01-Montilla, Alex]; Buckley, Timothy [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=197a3461d9824a17850f34cc2b0b37fe-Buckley, Timothy]
Subject:	RE: Cincinnati PWS service area

For background, OW has never allow us to "map" SDWIS facilities in ECHO, so it is not surprising to me that they don't have lat/longs. That's also why I'm skeptical that they have a file that would even allow us to put points on a map. Tom is correct that FRS has a lat/long for facilities, and the drinking water plants that have other interests, such as RCRA or NPDES, will acquire lat longs at the facility level via those other programs. Small drinking water facilities that have no other environmental interests frequently have no lat long. OW has maintained that often the lat/long of the drinking water plant is not a representation of the service area and sometimes can actually be out of the service area.

From: Gillespie, Andrew
Sent: Thursday, February 06, 2020 9:25 AM
To: Scheitlin, Tom <Scheitlin.Tom@epa.gov>; Montilla, Alex <Montilla.Alex@epa.gov>; Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>; Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Cincinnati PWS service area

Thanks Tom. I appreciate your thinking about this.
I think we should wait for the moment until we have some discussion with OW, and perhaps our own IOAA.
I am not sure we should be in the business of correcting OW data.
I am also not sure OW would appreciate us doing that... though I do have a guess...

Andrew J. R. Gillespie, Ph. D.
Associate Director, US EPA/ORD/CEMM
ORD Executive Lead for PFAS R&D

Office 919 541 3655 Cell [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]

From: Scheitlin, Tom <Scheitlin.Tom@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, February 06, 2020 8:57 AM
To: Andrew Stoeckle <Andrew.Stoeckle@erg.com>; Gillespie, Andrew <Gillespie.Andrew@epa.gov>; Montilla, Alex <Montilla.Alex@epa.gov>
Cc: Matthew Heyward <Matthew.Heyward@erg.com>; Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>; Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>; Lanier, Sarah <Lanier.Sarah@epa.gov>; Brielle Kissel Meade <Brielle.Kissel@erg.com>
Subject: RE: Cincinnati PWS service area

Alex and I discussed this yesterday and the UCMR data does include facility ID. Question is would it make sense to pull the location data from the facility ID. I know that the Geo groups have spent a lot of time cleaning up the data in FRS. It seems strange to me that OW did not populate the UCMR data with the Lat Long in FRS. There is a rest Service that would allow us to pull those locations if that would be a better option. https://www.epa.gov/frs/frs-rest-services

Just a thought.

Tom Scheitlin
Associate Director
Office of Science Information Management
Office of Research and Development
Phone: 919-541-0707
Cell: [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]
Email: scheitlin.tom@epa.gov

From: Andrew Stoeckle <Andrew.Stoeckle@erg.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 06, 2020 12:26 AM
To: Gillespie, Andrew <Gillespie.Andrew@epa.gov>; Montilla, Alex <Montilla.Alex@epa.gov>
Cc: Matthew Heyward <Matthew.Heyward@erg.com>; Buckley, Timothy <Buckley.Timothy@epa.gov>; Barrette, Michael <Barrette.Michael@epa.gov>; Scheitlin, Tom <Scheitlin.Tom@epa.gov>; Lanier, Sarah <Lanier.Sarah@epa.gov>; Brielle Kissel Meade <Brielle.Kissel@erg.com>
Subject: Cincinnati PWS service area

To close the loop,

- In UCMR 3, the Cincinnati, OH PWS reported one ZIP code to describe their service area (45228).
- In UCMR 4, they reported one ZIP code (45230). For UCMR 1, they reported no ZIP codes to describe their service area and one ZIP code in UCMR 2. Mining other, ideally more recent, UCMRs would not improve the situation for Cincinnati records.
- The Greater Cincinnati Water Works website says they serve 750,000 with a service area that includes "the entire City of Cincinnati, most of Hamilton County and parts of Butler and Warren Counties in Ohio. In 2003, GCWW started selling water to Boone County and Florence, Kentucky via a pipeline installed under the Ohio River." They are clearly missing ZIP codes.
- As Matthew and Alex pointed out, Qlik is rendering the reported service area ZIP codes for Cincinnati correctly. 45228 is not associated with a geographic area, just a point.
- OW has previously raised the quality/completeness of ZIP code reporting. To detect the prevalence of emerging contaminants, the results of required sampling and population served are certainly more important than geospatial specification of service areas. However, representation of service areas as points would be difficult to make sense of.
- The National PFAS Data Explorer's disclaimer for the UCMR layer discloses the issue of incomplete ZIP code reporting.

Andrew Stoeckle | VP, Information and Analysis | Eastern Research Group | o. 781.674.7261 c. [Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]